

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-22 will be pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,663,302 to Kelley, et al. Applicants do not admit that Kelley is prior art, and reserve the right to swear behind the reference. However, even if Kelley is prior art, Kelley does not show claimed features of the present invention. Namely, claims 1 and 15 recite a stacking portion and a balancing portion installed on a side opposite to the stacking portion. Kelley does not disclose this feature. In order to clarify this distinction, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15 to clarify that the stacking portion is installed opposite the balancing portion with reference to the guide shaft. As amended, claims 1 and 15 recite “*a stacking portion on a first side of said guide shaft . . . and a balancing portion installed on a side of said guide shaft opposite to the stacking portion*”.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP §2131. Because Kelley does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 15, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify the structure taught in Kelley into the claimed structure of the present invention. Among other advantages, Kelley requires two guide rails (28, 30) whereas embodiments of the present invention advantageously only require a single guide rail.

Claims 2-5, 18 and 19 depend from claims 1 or 15, and accordingly incorporate all of the elements of the claims from which they depend, and any

intervening claims. Therefore, based on the same arguments made with respect to claims 1 and 15, the rejections of claims 2-5, 18 and 19 should also be withdrawn.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-22 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6, 7, 9, 16, 20, and 21 have been rewritten in independent form, and allowance of these claims and any claims depending from them is requested.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Christian C. Michel
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,300

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: June 23, 2005